



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,434	12/21/2000	Takashi Fukuda	2000_1743A	5280

7590 04/17/2003

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
Suite 800
2033 K Street
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ANGEBRANDT, MARTIN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

6

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/741,434

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Martin J Angebranndt

Art Unit

1756

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____


3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-3.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Martin J Angebranndt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1756

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections over Brooks or Champagne in view of Natansohn et al. alone (paragraph 3 of the final office action).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The secondary references Bieringer et al., Eich et al. and Savant et al., teach azo containing polymers used in holographic recording. These would be expected to have the ability to undergo erasure as discussed in Natansohn et al. and would cycle (be erased or written upon) more rapidly due to the smaller polymer chains which inherently have less steric hinderance to movement of the azo moieties than larger polymers. The applicant is arbitrarily choosing one beam to be the first and the other to be the second. The scope of coverage sought indeed requires two beams, one larger than the other and overlapping during the interferometric exposure. The applicant fails to fully appreciate the consequences of "simultaneously irradiating" when interpreting the claims. The applicant also fails to argue beyond the first two references, when the rejections of record specifically recite their combination with other references. This is a piecemeal treatment of the rejection merely arguing a settled issue and cannot obviate the rejection of record. Of the references cited in the PTO-1449, the Ramanujam et al., Appl. Phys. Lett., Vol. 74(21) pp. 3227-3229 seem most interesting using the polyester having a number average MW of 3,100.

UA
9/16/03